

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/658,348	09/08/2003	Stephen D. Pacetti	50623.332	4082
7590 10/24/2006			EXAMINER	
Paul J. Meyer, Jr.			CAMERON, ERMA C	
Squire, Sanders	& Dempsey L.L.P.			
Suite 300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
One Maritime Plaza			1762	
San Francisco, CA 94111			DATE MAILED: 10/24/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/658,348	PACETTI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Erma Cameron	1762	

	1
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 13 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply time periods:	affidavit, or other evidence, which in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set fo no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the ma Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN 1	niling date of the final rejection.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amounder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply consecutive set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension fee originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL  A brief in compliance with 27 CER 41 27 must	ha filed within two months of the date of
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)) a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth i AMENDMENTS	, to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a br (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see N	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially appeal; and/or	reducing or simplifying the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	rejected claims.
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-	Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separation non-allowable claim(s).	
<ul> <li>7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 59-62. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 63. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 33-58.</li> </ul>	will be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affic was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to tentered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under apshowing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented.	peal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims afte REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	* * * *
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application See Continuation Sheet.	n in condition for allowance because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	_
13. Other:	
ERMA CAMERON	
PRIMARY EXAMINER	Erma Cameron Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1762

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: a) Paragraph 3 of 8/16/2006 office action (rejection of claim 63 under 112/first): the examiner disagrees that an active ingredient is not a critical or essential feature of the claimed invention. Page 1 of the specification, under "Field" descibes the invention as a diffusion barrier layer for inhibiting the release rate of an active ingredient. b) Paragraph 4 of 8/16/2006 office action (rejection of claim 63 under 112/first): the examiner disagrees that the specification supports the new matter of claim 63. The applicant has not demonstrated that the new matter is supported. c) Paragraph 5 of 8/16/2006 office action (rejection of claim 63 under 112/second): The examiner holds that the relationship between the regions is a critical feature of the claimed invention. For instance, it would be quite different to have two regions side by side as opposed to be stacked over each other, d) Paragraph 7 of the 8/16/2006 office action (objection to the specification because of trademarks): the amended specification appears to have overcome this objection.

ERMA CAMERON PRIMARY EXAMINER

Erma Cameron